REMARKS

The present application was filed on January 30, 2004 with claims 1-20. Claims 18-20 were canceled in Applicants' prior Amendment dated April 6, 2005. Claims 1-17 are currently pending in the application. In the outstanding Office Action dated May 27, 2005, the Examiner has: (i) rejected claims 1-5, 11, 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,489,881 to Aleksandravicius et al. (hereinafter "Aleksandravicius"); (ii) rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Aleksandravicius in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,872,504 to Greitschus et al. (hereinafter "Greitschus"); and (iii) indicated that claims 6-10 and 15-17 are allowable.

In this response, claims 1, 4 and 13 have been amended. Additionally, claims 6 and 15 have been amended by recasting same into independent form, including all of the limitations of their respective base claims and any intervening claims. Applicants traverse the §102(b) and §103(a) rejections for at least the reasons set forth below. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Applicants request an acknowledgment of the receipt of formal drawings filed on March 29, 2004 in the present application.

Claims 1-5, 11, 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Aleksandravicius. The Examiner merely maintains the rejection set forth in the prior Office Action dated January 6, 2005, contending that Aleksandravicius discloses each of the elements set forth in the subject claims. Applicants respectfully disagree with this contention.

With regard to independent claims 1 and 13, which are of similar scope, Applicants assert that these claims are distinguishable from the Aleksandravicius reference. Specifically, with reference to FIG. 9 of Aleksandravicius, the Examiner seems to analogize the resistive regions 60 and 62 to the first and second conductive paths recited in claim 1. However, resistive regions 60 and 62 are just different sections of the same resistor body formed between terminals T1 and T2. In contrast to Aleksandravicius, the first and second conductive paths recited in claim 1 are separate elements which are distinct from the resistor body itself. Furthermore, even assuming that resistive regions 60 and 62 disclosed in Aleksandravicius can be analogized to the first and second conductive paths set forth in claims 1 and 13, Aleksandravicius fails to teach or remotely suggest

the limitation that "at least one conductive terminal is configured such that a resistance of the at least one conductive terminal between the at least first and second conductive paths is substantially matched to a resistance of the resistor body between the at least first and second conductive paths," as required by claims 1 and 13.

Notwithstanding the above traversal, claims 1 and 13 have been amended for further clarification. Specifically, at least one of the first and second conductive paths is further defined as comprising "a resistive element connected between the at least one conductive terminal and the resistor body, the resistive element being separate from the resistor body" (emphasis added). The prior art fails to teach or suggest a semiconductor resistor formed in this manner. It is clear that the Examiner interprets Aleksandravicius as including conductive paths that are formed of the same resistor body. For instance, the Examiner states that "the whole piece of metal is a resistive element that includes terminals that are one piece with same" (final Office Action; page 2, lines 16-17).

Even assuming that wire bonds 50, 51, 52 taught by Aleksandravicius can be analogized to the resistive element recited in amended claims 1 and 13, since the wire bonds are separate from the resistor body, Aleksandravicius is completely silent as to adjusting a resistance of the conductive paths (e.g., wire bonds 50, 51, 52) associated with one or both conductive terminals (e.g., T1) so as to substantially match a resistance of the resistor body (e.g., 60, 61, 62) between the first and second conductive paths, as explicitly required by claims 1 and 13. In fact, Aleksandravicius fails to provide any disclosure at all relating to the resistance of the resistor body between any two given conductive paths corresponding to the first and/or second conductive terminal.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants assert that claims 1 and 13 as amended are patentable over the prior art. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance of these claims are respectfully solicited.

With regard to claims 2-5 and 11, which depend from claim 1, and claim 14, which depends from claim 13, Applicants submit that these claims are also patentable over the prior art of record by virtue of their dependency from their respective base claims, which are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons set forth above. Moreover, one or more of these claims define additional patentable subject matter in their own right. For example, claims 4 and 14 further define the resistive element as "having a resistance associated therewith that is substantially equal to the

resistance of the resistor body between the at least first and second conductive paths." The prior art fails to teach or suggest such a feature.

In addressing claim 4, the Examiner contends that "the whole piece of metal is a resistive element that includes terminals that are one piece with same" (final Office Action; page 2, lines 16-17). Applicants respectfully disagree with this contention and assert that Aleksandravicius fails to disclose a resistive element connected between at least one conductive terminal (e.g., T1) and the resistor body (e.g., 60). Even assuming, *arguendo*, that the wire bond itself may be considered to be the "resistive element" recited in claims 4 and 14, Aleksandravicius fails to disclose that the resistive element has a resistance associated therewith that is selected to be substantially equal to the resistance of the resistor body between the first and second conductive paths, as required by claims 4 and 14. Aleksandravicius is directed to an entirely different problem than that of the present invention. Specifically, Aleksandravicius is directed to providing a high current sense resistor while the claimed invention, in an illustrative embodiment, is directed to a semiconductor resistor having "a substantially uniform current distribution in one or more contact regions of the resistor" (Specification; page 2, lines 8-11; emphasis added).

For at least the reasons stated above, Applicants submit that claims 2-5, 11 and 14 are believed to be patentable over the prior art of record, not merely by virtue of their dependency from their respective base claims, but also in their own right. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance of claims 2-5, 11 and 14 are respectfully requested.

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Aleksandravicius in view Greitschus. Without characterizing the Greitschus reference, however, Applicants submit that claim 12, which depends from claim 1, is also patentable over the prior art of record by virtue of its dependency from claim 1, which is believed to be patentable for at least the reasons set forth above. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance of claim 12 are respectfully solicited.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe that pending claims 1-17 are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request withdrawal of the §102 and §103 rejections.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 29, 2005

Wayne L. Ellenbogen
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 43,602
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
90 Forest Avenue
Locust Valley, NY 11560
(516) 759-7662